

PLANNING COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2000

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. at Twin Pines Senior and Community Center.

PRESENT, COMMISSIONERS: Mathewson, Wiecha, Peirona, Purcell, Parsons

ABSENT, COMMISSIONER: Phillips

PRESENT, STAFF: Director Vanderprie, Senior Planner Livingstone, Contract Planner Ungo-McCormick, City Attorney Savaree, Recording Secretary Wong

AGENDA STUDY SESSION: None.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS: Director Vanderprie announced that staff had sent out public hearing notices for Drs. Jadallah and Jordan's property at 873-883 Ralston Av. which was discussed at the last Council meeting. Later in the week the architect informed staff that they were planning to redesign the project and the matter was taken off of the Commission agenda, but they were not able to get notices out to the public in time to tell them that it was not on the agenda. Director Vanderprie expected that this item would be on a future agenda and new hearing notices would be sent.

COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments): Adam Naser, 2845 Flores St. #2, San Mateo, perceived as a pattern of inefficiencies and complications in the way staff handled applications, that it was in no way in line with the way one would expect the good spirit that should distinguish a relationship between the City and the residents. He cited some examples: 1) people who came to hearings felt like they were coming to court, but he believed it was even worse because at least in court all evidence should be disclosed ahead of time. The applicants saw the staff report just a few days before they came to the hearing without a chance to amend their proposal or even clarify things as they should be. Sometimes the staff report included things that were miscommunicated. He asked why not give people the chance ahead of time to review the staff report, give them a chance to adjust their applications to fit the needs and requirements and save the Commission and residents the time and effort of going through Planning Commission meeting after meeting. He had not seen this in any other City in the Bay Area. 2) The applicants felt they were proven guilty before they came to the meeting and had to defend themselves. He quoted from a staff report that said that staff recommended denial and a resolution of denial was prepared and the conditions of approval had not been prepared. He wondered if staff or the Commission made the decision, and how much influence did staff have by using such techniques just to delay the process of the application. Why not communicate frankly to the applicant the issues that must be dealt with and if an impasse was reached, then come to the Commission for a resolution? He felt that would be more efficient and save time and effort for everybody. He felt there was a deliberate ambiguity in the Planning Division's requirements and guidelines, i.e., the City should issue written guidelines on color, style, and materials that were clear that would allow people to prepare their applications more accurately. He cared about increasing the efficiency of the process and wanted to

make sure that people's liberties were not taken away by introducing bureaucratic procedures that were not necessary and not in the good will of the people and not for the good future of the City.

Responding to Mr. Naser's comments, Director Vanderprieem stated that there was a binder of preapproved colors that anyone could select from. The Commission recommended some style guidelines to the Council last October that was referred back to the Commission for some changes and would be on next Tuesday's Council agenda for adoption. There would then be some very clear style and material guidance for people in the downtown area. Regarding the time between getting an application to the Commission and receiving the staff report, he stated that most people opt for the soonest hearing date they could get and were willing to get the staff report a few days ahead of the meeting. Normally there had been communication between the applicant and staff regarding any deficiencies in the plan and they had worked with the applicant to incorporate those changes into the project. If they were to afford more time between receiving the staff report and the hearing date it would simply mean the hearing date would be later so people normally chose the earlier hearing date and were willing to cut back on the time allowed for reviewing the staff report. Anyone who came before the Commission normally had been through a review with staff and either changes had been made in the project or staff had made the decision to let the applicant's ideas come forward so the Commission could have the benefit of seeing what the applicant was proposing.

Mr. Naser countered that when an applicant received the report one day in advance, the applicant would definitely opt to go to the hearing because it took years before an application would get approved. He felt staff should prepare their report far ahead and deliver it to the applicant and let the applicant decide after whether or not they wanted to go to the hearing, but not withhold the application until the last minute. He wanted written communication that was solid and clear ahead of time and let the applicant decide when they wanted to go to the Commission.

Chair Parsons stated that staff reports were based on the final submittal by the applicant, and many applicants submitted their final drawings and information only a few days before the packet had to go out; therefore, many times it was the applicant as much as staff who caused the problem. Perhaps drawings were not in adequate detail, or changes had been made that had been discussed and staff waited to write the report until they had the final set of drawings.

Commissioner Peirona asked that this testimony be typed up and sent to him so he could review it and see if there were some valid points that could be discussed at the end of a meeting. Normally the case was that just before an item was to be heard a lot of new things happened. There were some valid statements and concerns and by the Commission reading them and maybe discussing them they might be able to improve the system. He would like a set of notes in his next packet so that it could be discussed at the end of the meeting.

Director Vanderprieem added that staff encouraged comments like these but found it hard to address generalities, such as "it was too long", and it would be helpful for the comments to be specific. He believed it was possible that the applicant was referring to an item on the agenda this evening and if that application was the motivation for making these comments, then the staff recommendation was made clear to the applicant before they even made the application to the Planning Division.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Action Minutes of January 18, 2000

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public Hearing - 3034 San Juan Blvd.; To consider a design review, grading plan, tree removal permit, and variance to allow construction of a new single family dwelling of approximately 3,338 sq. ft. on an existing 13,000 sq. ft. lot. and to allow the single family dwelling to encroach four (4) feet into a required fifteen (15) foot front yard setback (Appl. No. 99-1117); APN: 043-162-910; Zoning: R-1B; CEQA Status: Exempt; Javier Chavarria (Applicant); Carlos Aubain (Owner)

Director Vanderpriem presented the staff report recommending approval with conditions. In response to Commissioner Purcell, Director Vanderpriem replied that the architect had provided a supplemental letter that explained that there would be sufficient site distance from where the retaining wall ended and the traveled roadway began.

Dennis David, JC Engineering, stated that with the new design they had notched back 10' from the sidewalk, leaving a good line of sight.

Commissioner Parsons opened the public hearing.

Ian Sherr, 3030 San Juan Blvd., a student at Carlmont High School, stated that he was concerned about: the lack of parking on San Juan Blvd. in his area around 8:30 p.m.; removal of many valuable oak trees; destroying the habitat, deer trails, rats' nests, and ants; and the construction noise being heard in the canyon.

Chair Parsons stated that there was a set of drawings in the back of the room for anyone who wished to look at them. Chair Parsons noted that trees were being replaced at a ratio of 3:1 and understood the speaker's concerns, however, the Commission had to look at the property rights of the owner. Chair Parsons added that the same things probably could have been said when Mr. Sherr's house was built. Commissioner Peirona stated that he welcomed Mr. Sherr's comments and added that he wished more young people would come forward and speak out.

Allen Cheng, 3038 San Juan Blvd., was concerned about: 1) possible earth movement of the excavation site due to an earthquake or several days of heavy rain prior to completion of the retaining wall, with the potential catastrophe for the street of San Juan and the accessibility of emergency vehicles; 2) the excavation would require 100 or more large dump trucks and equipment with the possibility of street damage; and he had provided a report from the City of Tiburon regarding damage to streets by construction vehicles; 3) the type of drainage that would be proposed so as not to impact negatively any downslope properties; 4) probable negative environmental impact for the deer colony, the loss of several large heritage oak trees, and excessive construction noise and dust in a small and narrow canyon area; and 5) asked about any parking accommodations that would be made for the neighbors during and after construction, and about accessibility for emergency vehicles.

Director Vanderprieem stated that there was a condition for some fairly extensive requirements from the Public Works Department. Typically, the site haul route would be videotaped so to provide a record of the existing pavement condition and then checked again after the hauling work. A bond was posted for repair to the roadway and the applicant was responsible for paying for the repair costs of the roadway. There was also some fairly extensive drainage requirements that would collect the drainage from the hillside. Chair Parsons added that there was a moratorium on grading during the rainy season and stringent requirements during grading that proper protective measures of surrounding hillsides must be adhered to. Director Vanderprieem added that grading could only occur during dry weather, a geotechnical report was prepared looking at the grading plan and there was a requirement that an Engineering Geologist be present on-site during the grading operation. If any temporary stabilization measures needed to be taken he would have the contractor do that at the site. Chair Parsons stated that the project proposed four parking spaces on the site and the total grading plan was reduced to 950'. Regarding parking during construction, Chair Parsons stated that there would be a staging area for construction vehicles but there was typically the loss of some parking spaces during the daytime hours but not at night. Director Vanderprieem added that it might be useful for clarity to add to Condition 11, which referred to the hauling permit, to add "pavement along the haul route" to make sure that it was called out clearly.

MOTION: By Commissioner Peirona, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

The Commission's comments included: shared the concerns of the speakers who were not very happy about the project; not satisfied with the findings of safety and felt increasingly meeting after meeting as if instead of protecting heritage trees she was merely presiding over their slaughter; even though the applicant had reduced the grading, she felt it was not nearly enough considering the stringent standards that they had been applying to cut and fill over the last couple of years; didn't feel that this was a buildable lot with the grading and heritage trees considered; the required retaining walls bothered her in terms of soils stability; felt that the property owner had the right to develop his property; the Commission's job was to make sure that they do it with the least amount of impact; felt that the applicant had gone as far as they could go in reducing the grading, and feared they would see a lot more of this in Belmont since the only lots that were left were similar lots.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Purcell to approve Resolution No. 2000-11 approving design review, variance, grading plan, and tree removal permit for a single-family residence at 3034 San Juan Boulevard and to add a condition that small oaks and other native trees shall be transplanted as determined feasible by the City Arborist:

AYES: Mathewson, Wiecha, Peirona, Parsons

NOES: Purcell

ABSENT: Phillips

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within ten days.

Public Hearing - 2514 Ralston Av.; To consider a design review, floor area ratio (FAR) exception, and tree removal permit to allow the construction of a 2,950 sq. ft. single-family home where a maximum of 1,200 sq. ft. is allowed (Appl. No. 98-1052); APN: 043-322-450; Zoning: HRO-2 (in process); CEQA Status: Exempt; Kamal Fallaha (Applicant/Owner)

Contract Planner Ungo-McCormick presented the staff report recommending denial.

Director Vanderpriem added that the site involved an effort that went back into the early 90's. In 1993, a report was presented to the City Council indicating that the lot was permitted 1,200 square feet. In 1997, another staff report was presented to the City Council indicating that the lot would be allowed 1,200 square feet. In meeting with the applicant on the site, there was a prolonged discussion about why there should be more square footage than that, but one that would require a lot line adjustment. On this application the applicant asked for a hearing date before the staff report was prepared and Director Vanderpriem personally logged that date for the applicant. He reminded everyone that the Council only took an action on the rezoning last Tuesday on this property and staff had tried to speed it up by bringing to the Commission the application before the zoning was even effective. He also mentioned that the original application was for a larger house for 3,500 sq. ft., and as the applicant went to the City Council in January, the project was redesigned to be smaller. The issues of timing, staff report and redesign, had all been illustrated in this one application and had all been pretty much directed by the applicant - they've been given clear direction, the opportunity to redesign and had redesigned, and had asked for and received an earlier hearing date. Staff had to speed up preparation of the report so they were not able to get it out well ahead of the hearing but they knew from the beginning and it was certainly in the file for the last seven years that the amount of square footage permitted on the site was 1,200 sq. ft. Director Vanderpriem commented that what was unusual about the site was that it involved a lot and a half and noted that the lots to the right were developed and permits were issued over ten years ago before the San Juan Plan was effective and was in a different zoning district. Technically this was an illegal subdivision and the cure was merging the property at the time a building permit was issued. Staff was not terribly concerned about the illegality of the subdivision but from a technical standpoint there was no need to issue a permit on any lot that was involved in an illegal subdivision. This had not been made an issue for the applicant but the intent of the ordinance was to merge lots and felt that it would be fair to credit the applicant for merging the properties. When an adjacent lot was merged with a single lot the ordinance provided for an additional 900 sq. ft. to be added to that lot in building area. Since the applicant had a half a lot that he would be merging, staff felt it would be fair to add half of that amount to their lot, or 450 sq. ft. Staff, therefore, thought that the applicant was reasonably entitled to 1,650 sq. ft. and that would be a fair interpretation of the zoning ordinance for the applicant and met the intent of the ordinance. Responding to Chair Parsons' question, Director Vanderpriem replied that the applicant was advised of this early on but did not agree with the 1,650 sq. ft. and felt that it should be 2,400 sq. ft.

Commissioner Wiecha asked for clarification of the area of new fill near the grade beam and asked why the fill was being placed on a slope in the configuration shown. Contract Planner Ungo-McCormick deferred that question to the applicant/engineer, and showed on the site plan which trees were being proposed for removal. She added that there was a sidewalk on the opposite side of the street and would

prefer not to have a sidewalk on both sides of the street since there was not as much traffic, however, this was a standard condition of the Public Works Department.

Kamal Fallaha, 708 Crane Av., Foster City, thanked staff for making his presentation easier but he disagreed with some of the findings regarding tree removal and the house. He stated that when he first submitted his application he was under the impression that this was just preliminary; he knew what size house and the footprint of the house he could live with and would then submit a complete and detailed design to the City. If he needed to provide sidewalks on both sides of the street, then the tree was in his way. Mr. Fallaha hoped the Commission would understand this and take it into consideration. He said that he would go ahead and extend the road based on the already approved plans. Mr. Fallaha described the proposed house. He stated that this was the first time he heard Director Vanderpriem say that he was allowed more than 1,200 sq. ft. because every time he called he understood that all the lots, regardless of size, were limited to a predetermined figure. Mr. Fallaha said that this new information would help him greatly and would change all of the measurements. He tried to set the house as high on the lot as possible to minimize grading and to keep the retaining walls to a minimum, save some trees, and shield the neighbors. The footprint was selected because tree removal was an issue. The house would impact one single oak tree's two branches, and he tried to set the house to minimize tree removal. He presented pictures of how the house would look on the lot. He stated that the driveway would not appear bulky as it would be supported by two columns and one beam. The amount of grading would be minimal. He described the fill around the house.

Chair Parsons stated that they did not have enough of a grading plan and the applicant indicated that there was about 150 cu. yds. of fill for under the sidewalk and under the road. Commissioner Purcell asked if the 26" oak tree could be saved if the sidewalk was eliminated. Commissioner Wiecha replied that it was in conflict with the driveway. Director Vanderpriem said that the driveway setback requirement was 10% of the lot width which would be 7.7 feet. Mr. Fallaha thought that the tree could be saved with the current design. Mr. Fallaha said that there was a 5-8' retaining wall for extending the road because of the terrain and would not be visible from Ralston Avenue. Chair Parsons stated that if the house could be moved over 1-1/2 feet and angled the driveway, then the oak tree could be saved. Commissioner Wiecha asked the applicant to elaborate on how the tree could be saved. Mr. Fallaha replied that if he moved the retaining wall five ft., then there wouldn't be that much buildup and impact on the tree. Commissioner Wiecha wanted to know how the driveway bridge would be notched around the tree trunk. Mr. Fallaha responded that he would shift the driveway 1-1/2 feet and that he could apply for a variance on the side yard. Commissioner Wiecha reviewed the trees to be removed. Chair Parsons clarified that the FAR was actually .37. Director Vanderpriem noted that there was a communication gap on the allowable square footage and pointed out that the driveway could be narrowed down to 12' wide provided one could back out safely. Staff could work with the applicant to save that tree and make that driveway narrower. Chair Parsons felt it was redundant to have a sidewalk on both sides of the street since it was just a frontage street. Director Vanderpriem agreed and believed that the sidewalk was eliminated on the approved road plan on that side since it was not really serving a good purpose. Chair Parsons asked if the Commission had ever approved a plan that had a tree right on the edge of a road by putting a guardrail around it. Director Vanderpriem stated that similar things had been done and there was a provision in the subdivision ordinance to modify the City standards to preserve trees. Director Vanderpriem felt that as long as it was done with the proper curvature for street sweeping and if the fire department didn't have a problem with it; he recalled that they had

stated that they would not require a turnaround at the end of the street as they would fight a fire from Ralston Avenue. There was a consensus that if there was a house to be built here, then they could live without the sidewalk on the north side of the street and they needed to clarify what trees would have to be removed and clarified the square footage.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing. Nobody came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Commissioner Purcell, seconded by Commissioner Wiecha to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

Commissioner Purcell stated that she was glad that the discussion so far answered many of her concerns about the trees and the retaining wall but she still had a problem with the size. She said that she would go along with staff to deny the FAR exception, the tree removal permit, and the design review as it was presented.

Responding to Commissioner Peirona, Director Vanderprieem replied that the property to the west was privately owned although the City did buy two lots further down and now owned five lots in the area but there was the potential for a couple of more homes beyond this one. He clarified that there would be less than three homes unless somebody wanted to build a 1,200 sq. ft. home or if the City wanted to sell some of the square footage it had on the five lots, and that the lots were not contiguous to this property but would have to be along the same roadway. Commissioner Peirona commented that the house did not show to be a very large house because of the way it sat down the hill, so the issue was not mass, but he was having a problem dealing with trees, grading, and precedents. He was skeptical that they were putting something on the property as soon as it was available without really looking at it in more detail. It was odd to him that somebody could build something there if they bought enough lots and it didn't change what was going to be built there except they had the right to build it if they owned two lots. He was concerned that the Commission was saying that if you gave the City money, then we'll let you build there. Director Vanderprieem stated that the Council said that they would not sell those lots and the value of purchasing them was not much to the City but was more valuable to the citizens to keep them as open space. He added that if a FAR exception were granted on this lot it didn't necessarily set a precedent for the next lot if the topography was significantly different or if there were more trees coming out. His problem was to come up with a decision tonight when there were so many other things that impact what his decision would be. He would want to see the slopes, sizes, ownership, etc., of the other lots as he felt that if they were going to develop one there would be more.

Commissioner Wiecha felt that the proposed house would be a very massive structure. Commissioner Peirona noted that there was a letter from the neighbor next door who did not want to see a 1,200 sq. ft. house. Chair Parsons noted that the proposal would still exceed the FAR by 1,000 sq. ft. which was excessive.

MOTION: By Commissioner Peirona to continue the public hearing. The motioned died for lack of a second.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Purcell to approve Resolution No. 2000-12 denying a floor area ratio exception, design review, and tree removal permit at 2514 Ralston Avenue:

Commissioner Mathewson agreed with finding #3.

AYES: Wiecha, Peirona, Purcell, Mathewson, Parsons

Chair Parsons encouraged the applicant to consider a smaller house on the property and possibly come back with revised plans. Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

At 9:05 p.m., Chair Parsons called for a recess. The meeting reconvened at 9:13 p.m.

Public Hearing - 655, 657, and 659 Middle Rd.; To consider a design review and conditional use permit to modify an existing triplex for a new single car detached garage, interior remodel to add one bedroom, a landscape plan, and new retaining wall (Appl. No. 99-1108); APN: 044-222-030; Zoning: R-4; CEQA Status: Exempt; Kent Harvey (Applicant); Robert Russell (Owner)

Senior Planner Livingstone presented the staff report recommending approval with conditions.

City Attorney Savaree brought the Commission up to date on the enforcement proceedings against the applicant. She stated that a complaint for injunctive relief was filed with the Superior Court and that the applicant had been very cooperative with staff since that time. The present application was a result of discussions and direction given by staff. A trial date of April 17 had been set, and if planning approvals were not granted, then the trial would move forward. The injunctive relief pleadings asked the Court to order the applicant to either remove the illegal construction or obtain all necessary approvals from the City to do whatever corrective work would be necessary and then have a permanent project.

Laurie Rose, 665 Middle Road, #3, stated that she was pleased with the moving of the wall and the proposed concrete ballards to prevent cars from coming over. She liked the fact that the applicant would be required to plant a hedge on top of the retaining wall to provide her with some privacy. She stated that the current illegal retaining wall needed to be changed because it was built with dry-rotted boards. She confirmed with staff that the new wall was 5' high. She asked that the existing trees not be removed because they were fruit-bearing trees and provided a lot of food for the wildlife, and she saw no imperative reason to remove them. She asked for an explanation of why the retaining wall at her complex had to be concrete and this one will be wood. Senior Planner Livingstone responded that the wooden retaining wall could work when engineered using I-beams. Chair Parsons speculated that the reason her landlord had to use concrete could be because of its proximity to the existing foundation of the building whereas the one in question was not proximate to or supporting a building foundation. She asked that she be given a few weeks notice before excavation began so that she could move the garden she had planted on the property.

MOTION: By Commissioner Peirona, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

Responding to Chair Parsons' question about why the existing trees needed to be removed, Senior Planner Livingstone stated that they were not good examples of their species; they were bushy and needed pruning, and the Parks and Recreation Director recommended that they be removed and replaced with the new landscaping to create a hedge around. The applicant stated that he could work around them. Chair Parsons stated that since they were established plants and served a value, he recommended that the landscaping be worked around them if possible. Director Vanderpriem stated that two of the three trees being recommended for removal were on the perimeter of the parking area and the desirability of having olives or cherries dropped on the cars needed to be considered. He added

that a cherry tree and an olive were being saved, and that the olive tree that was shown for removal might be far enough away from the parking area so as not to be a problem. Commissioner Mathewson added that the trees could be pruned on the parking lot side. Chair Parsons asked that staff work with the applicant to save as many trees as possible.

MOTION: By Commissioner Mathewson, seconded by Commissioner Peirona to approve Resolution No. 2000-13 approving a conditional use permit and design review to convert an existing garage space to living space and build a one-car garage at 655, 657, and 659 Middle Road and to add a condition that the applicant shall work with staff to preserve existing trees on site and to notify the neighbor two weeks prior to the start of the retaining wall construction and grading:

Director Vanderpriem added that he hoped the applicant would work with the neighbor regarding her garden.

AYES: Peirona, Purcell, Mathewson, Wiecha, Parsons

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

Commissioner Peirona recused himself from the next item since he lived within 300' of the property.

Public Hearing - 1700 Notre Dame Av.; To consider a design review and variance to add a second story addition and first-story addition and remodel of approximately 2,083.4 sq. ft. to an existing 1,124.58 sq. ft. single-family home for a total of 3,207.9 sq. ft. where a total of 3,500 sq. ft. is allowed; and to allow continuation of existing encroachments into the side yard setbacks for a minimum five (5) ft. setback where six (6) ft. is required (Appl. No. 99-1152); APN: 044-131-220; Zoning: R-1B; CEQA Status: Exempt; Raynold C. Viotti, Jr. (Applicant); Jeff and Cindy Vassallo (Owners)

Contract Planner Ungo-McCormick presented the staff report recommending approval with conditions. For clarification, she added that the bay window shown in the existing side yard would not be allowed under the ordinance, but the architect was in agreement that the window could be eliminated or the floor plan could be revised so that it becomes a fireplace.

Ray Viotti, applicant, stated that he was available to answer any questions, and, responding to Commissioner Purcell, added that the tree scheduled for removal would be in the front of the house and was a small pine.

MOTION By Commissioner Purcell, seconded by Commissioner Mathewson to close the public hearing. The motion passed.

The Commission's comments included: felt that the exterior architecture was "pretty blah" and "uninspired" as she was not a fan of 90's architecture; no problem with the design and felt that it took advantage of a very odd lot; and he could support maintenance of the existing variances, with the removal of the bay window. Responding to Commissioner Wiecha, Mr. Viotti replied that the exterior product would be a natural sandstone of varying shapes.

MOTION: By Commissioner Wiecha, seconded by Commissioner Purcell to approve Resolution No. 2000-14 approving design review and variance for a single-family residence at 1700 Notre Dame

Avenue and to add a condition that the plans shall be revised to eliminate the bay encroachment onto the west (right) side yard or replace the bay with the fireplace as permitted by Code:

AYES: Purcell, Mathewson, Wiecha, Parsons

ABSENT: Phillips

RECUSED: Peirona

Chair Parsons announced that the Commission's decision could be appealed to the City Council within 10 days.

REPORTS, STUDIES, UPDATES, AND COMMENTS

Director Vanderpriem reminded the Commissioners of the forthcoming Planners Institute, and added that he and Principal Planner de Melo would also be attending.

A couple of the Commissioners felt that the applicant of the Davey Glen site had made a giant step in the right direction. Commissioner Wiecha apologized that she was not able to attend the field trip. Commissioner Purcell felt that the layouts for the pedestrian pathways were extremely effective and learned a great deal about the trees and their conditions. Commissioner Parsons noted that the applicant was making a genuine attempt to relocate a considerable number of the oak trees.

Chair Parsons commented that he would like to be sure that at least one liaison attend each City Council meeting as he believed that it was very important to maintain a close liaison on the projects being appealed. Director Vanderpriem informed the Commission that 900 Sixth Avenue and 1860 Oak Knoll would be reviewed at the next Council meeting, and added that 1840 Robin Whipple would be considered at the March 14th meeting.

Chair Parsons noted that the next meeting would be on Wednesday, March 8, due to the Tuesday election. Commissioner Wiecha announced that she would not be able to attend.

Chair Parsons stated that he would like to review the community forum comments with Director Vanderpriem. Director Vanderpriem suggested that the speaker during community forum should be invited to the two workshops that Councilmember Warden would be holding and that perhaps a commissioner or staff member should talk directly with the speaker to determine the specifics as it was difficult to respond to generalities.

Chair Parsons asked if staff was planning to agendize the issue of revising the two-car garage. Director Vanderpriem replied that he had tentatively placed it on the March 8 meeting thinking that the Council would consider it at their February 22 meeting and staff could incorporate their comments into a recommendation to the Commission on March 8, however, the Council would be considering the Robin Whipple item later than that, and he thought that at least one of the Councilmembers had expressed a concern that they be able to provide some input. Director Vanderpriem said that this item could be left on the March 8 agenda for an initial discussion or it could be scheduled after the Council discussed Robin Whipple. Director Vanderpriem stated that this would be a fairly straight forward issue and said the ordinance needed to be clearer that it was a requirement to upgrade the garage unless a variance was applied for to escape from that requirement. Director Vanderpriem stated that it was the

Commission's pleasure to either consider the item after the Council's discussion on March 14, or leave the item on for an initial presentation; and the Commission could decide if they were comfortable with the recommendation or, after reading the staff report, the Commission could decide to wait for more information from the Council.

Chair Parsons asked if there were any comments.

Commissioner Mathewson said that the Commission should go ahead and discuss it, and let the Council know how the Commission felt. Chair Parsons stated that the Commission could provide input to the Council and the Council could make a final decision. Chair Parsons stated that there was a consensus to agendaize the item. Chair Parsons said that if the Council felt that the Commission was off track, then the Council could give guidance to the Commission. Chair Parsons said that the sooner this item was clarified the better because the Commission would be getting more and more requests for major additions to existing houses with a single car garage and a month could make a big difference. Director Vanderpriem stated that it would be helpful to get this resolved before or soon after the April 15 date when staff started issuing permits.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m. to meet at a regular session on March 8, 2000.

Carlos de Melo

Acting, Planning Commission Secretary